

Abstract

In everyday church life a confounding of the teachings of the New Testament related to the God-sonship of the Christian believers can be perceived frequently. The need to clarify this question raised the motivation to carry out this scrutiny.

As a starting point, the elements of the teaching of the Old Testament about the fatherhood of God were enumerated. Israel as a child is the carrier of God-sonship based on the election and calling of the Lord. In relation to the God-sonship of the anointed king the impact of the contemporary “man-vassal” language can be supposed with high probability. The widow and the orphan are in a special life situation in which their opportunities are narrowed, thus, they can rely on God alone, who is their father therefore. The group of the “sons of God” can be identified with the members of the heavenly court. The conclusion can be reached about the Old Testament that except for the anointed king, the idea of God-sonship applied to individuals is not present yet, but only regarding collective groups.

This process of individualization begins in the deuterocanonical literature, but in the same time the conventional people-related fatherhood is also continuing to exist. In the pseudepigraphical Book of 1 Enoch the tendency becomes definite that “the saint and the just” belong to the category of God’s sons. In the Qumran material appears the addressing of God as “My Father”, at least in narrated texts. This provides a refutation of the thesis of Joachim JEREMIAS, according to whom this phenomenon did not appear before Jesus. At Philo of Alexandria numerous forms of God’s fatherhood appears which was not known in Jewish literature before. One of the chief results of this present research, meant to be a scientific novelty, is the proposal to take into consideration *Spec. leg.* 1.317-318 as a contemporary parallel text in the interpretation of Mt 23:9. At Josephus Flavius the emphasized idea is the

universal fatherhood of God. It is very interesting that this functions as an argument against suicide. An outlook on the targums, the literature of rabbinic Judaism and the Kabbalistic tradition ends the sketchy enumeration of the Jewish literature outside of the Palestinian canon.

The model of adoption, which characterizes the theological thinking of Paul the is taken into consideration first from the New Testament. The etymological and possible cultural background of the specifically Pauline *terminus technicus*, the υἱοθεσία is taken under scrutiny. Jewish and (Greco-)Roman possibilities emerged in this context. Researchers putting emphasis only on the Jewish roots were introduced. Two of them were highlighted who each dedicated a monograph to this question. SCOTT argued on behalf of the extension of the God-sonship of the anointed king in 2 Sam 7:14, while BYRNE on behalf of the Pauline expanding of the sonship of Israel as people. From those assuming rather Roman background - who seem to form the majority of scholars-, the thoughts of BURKE and CORLEY are highlighted among others. Presenting the Roman law-institution of adoption in a detailed manner serves the goal of equipping the reader with the associative background which a hellenized/romanized Christian contemporary to Paul supposedly may have possessed when reading the epistles of the apostle. Based on Udo SCHNELLE'S opinion, the abandonment of the forcing of "either-or" exegesis is recommended.

From the related Pauline texts in the most detailed way the letter to the Galatians is examined. To shed light on the historical background of the specific situation of the original readers is important since the apostle reflects and reacts on this. Paul considers as a regression to an obsolete phase of salvation history to take on the yoke of Mosaic law by getting circumcised by the Gentile Christian Galatians. Moreover, in his view, this is a trampling on the gospel preached by him. The promise given to Abraham has not lost its validity because of the intervention of the Mosaic law and it was fulfilled in Christ. This way

both the Jewish Christian and the Gentile Christian form one family and are adopted sons of God. In Gal 3:27 the picture of baptism come up, and also an excursus to Tit 3:5 seems to be relevant dealing with rebirth and baptism, as well. Regarding Romans 8 the role of the Law and the Spirit is mapped in relation to adopted sonship, mentioning also the Pauline eschatological tension, and the possible understanding of the notion πρωτότοκος. The dissertation contains the full text of the only extant whole Greek adoption contract. Based on this document and the wording of Psalm 89 the conclusion is deducted that πρωτότοκος does not necessary mean a first-born person in a literal sense. In case of Rom 9:4, Paul's re-interpreted Israel-notion is scrutinized coming to the result that the apostle's thinking is not supersessionist but rather continuing and incorporative. In Eph 1:5 the ideology of Rom 8 returns but in this locus a bigger emphasis is put on the first member of the eschatological binary code, the "already". Two non-υιοθεσία God-sonship texts are also examined. While there is a paraphrase-like reference to the God-sonship of Israel in Fil 2:15, in 2 Cor 6,18 the same happens in relation to the anointed king referring to 2 Sam 7:14. The image of child-bearing and birth also appears by the apostle, but not between God and the human beings but himself and his spiritual children. Finally, the Letter to the Hebrews is treated briefly, as well, since regarding the way of becoming the sons of God it is the closest to the adoption-model.

The model of bearing/engendering is specific to the Johannine theology. The existence of the so-called Johannine anti-language is stated. The approach chosen in this chapter is not the analysis of all relevant Bible texts one after each other but the examination of key-expressions of the Johannine language-universe related to the God-sonship and through these that of the most important loci. Based on this, the statement can be done that the τέκνα θεου designation is the reflection of the self-understanding of the Johannine community. The double-meaning of the verb γεννάω is clarified, arguing that related to God's activity from the acts of childbearing or engendering the latter one is the more

probable. Similarly, the second one is opted for in case of the word ἄνωθεν when raising the dilemma between “anew” and “from above.” Regarding the ἐκ – preposition TRUMBOWER’S “fixed origin”-theory is analyzed and rejected. A consequence of 1 Jn based on János BOLYKI can be phrased as the following: In that person whose engenderer was God, God’s spiritual engendering force remains, as the act of engendering is in a continuing effect and determines the existence of the engendered being. The exegetical problems of translating the word μονογενής (only-begotten) correctly are also taken into account. The reasons leading to the distortion of its meaning are enumerated. A passage from 1 Pt also talks about rebirth which is treated here.

The Matthean sonship-interpretation is titled as the behaviorist model. The fatherhood-image here is exclusive and relational. The adjective “heavenly” related to this is also scrutinized. A serious attention is paid to its complementary, the rejection of earthly fatherhood. While the traits of the heavenly Father are positive for the disciple, earthly fathers *expressis verbis* only appear in negative roles in Matthew’s gospel. The second novelty of this thesis is raised at this point related to the proper meaning of Mt 23:22. Both Archelaus and Herod Antipas are sons of Herod the Great, but Archelaus resembles in cruelty supposedly much more his father than the other son. The negative tone regarding earthly fathers is consequently traced through examples from the whole gospel. At Mt 23:9 a very sharp critique is addressed to the majority point of view, and the necessity of taking into consideration the above-mentioned Philo-text is emphasized again. A radical interpretation of discipleship and non-discipleship is stated trying to find the real division-line within the personal sphere of the ethics of following Jesus. PATTARUMADATHIL’S thesis is presented about discipleship as a process of becoming children of God. The hardships in interpreting δικαιοσύνη in Matthew’s gospel is also delineated. The preferred understanding of it briefly put is fulfilling the will of God. The δικαιοσύνη-passages are examined each by

each, also criticizing the different scholarly approaches to them. The teaching regarding the fatherhood of God in and outside the Sermon on the Mount is scrutinized. The sonship has strong connections to the practicing of δικαιοσύνη. After analyzing the Lord's prayer the relationship of Christ's sonship to the Christian believers' is also taken into consideration. In summary, the appearance of the Father's traits on the disciples will be the entrée of the fulfillment of their being in the state of God-sonship in their Father's kingdom.

Luke 20:34-36 gives the basis for founding a fourth model of God-sonship, which is connected to the resurrection. Partaking in the latter constitutes God-sonship according to this Lukan approach.

Finally, a fifth model is also raised, which one is in a certain sense a "cocoon in the nest", since it is about the universal fatherhood of God. Its exceptionality is due to the fact that this is not specifically Christian, but is related to all people.

After the diachronic approaches finally a chapter is dedicated to the synchronic adaptation of cognitive metaphor-theory to the theme of God-sonship. A synoptic view of the whole problem can be reached this way.

These five models ought not be mingled or mixed. Each of them receives its place in the Holy Scripture by its own right. Forming synthesis among them should not be a goal either. Each of them sheds a unique light on specific aspects of the God-human relationship ungraspable by the tools of human language.